DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 172 CS 207 324

AUTHOR Hartzog, Carol; And Others
TITLE A Report on the Freshman Writing Program.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Dept. of English.
PUB DATE Oct 82
NOTE 50p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Students; *College English; College Freshmen; Course Descriptions; *Course Evaluation; Curriculum Development; *English Curriculum; English Departments; Higher Education; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Instruction; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS Freshman Composition; *University of California Los Angeles; *Writing Programs

ABSTRACT

This review of the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) Writing Programs was undertaken for several reasons, among them the rapid increase of research in writing, the inconsistency among courses, and the need to reshape and expand the programs. The report begins with a summary of earlier reviews of UCLA's composition program. Following a brief discussion of the nature of the review committees, the report describes administrative changes and proposes a freshman writing program, listing its general principles, curriculum, goals, course descriptions, textbooks, and testing. Recommendations are offered for courses and their requirements and for changes in teaching assignments, orientation, training, committees, courses, and reviews. The report concludes with projections for bilingual and second language students, freshman preparatory programs, and remediation. Appendixes include a history of the review, a list of subcommittee members and their charges, subcommittee reports, an instructor's guide, and a sourcebook for the new writing teacher. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225172

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A Report on the Freshman Writing Program

University of California

Los Angeles

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Hartzog

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

October 1982

Prepared by Carol Hartzog, Mike Rose,
Patricia Taylor, Susan Brienza, and Cheryl Bolin

CS207324

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Reasons for the Review 1

Pegagogical 1
Cultural 2
Administrative 2

II. Earlier In-House Research 3

III. Nature of the Review 4

IV. Administrative Changes 5

V. The Proposed Freshman Writing Program 6

General Principles 6
Curriculum 7
Goals 9
Course Descriptions 11
Textbooks 11
Testing 11

VI. Recommendations 12

Course Offerings and Requirements 12

Development and Review 13
Teaching Assignments 13
Orientation 13
Training 13
Committees 13
Courses 13
Review 14

VII. Projections 14

Bilingual and Second-Language Students 14
Freshman Preparatory Program 15
Remediation 15

Appendices

1. History of the Review.....17

2. Sub-Committee Members and Charges.....20

3. Sub-Committee Reports.....26

4. Instructor's Guide 29

Philosophy 29
Sample Syllabi 31
Proposal on Research/Library Skills.....44

5. A Sourcebook for the New Writing Teacher 46

A Report on the Freshman Writing Program

In 1979, UCLA Writing Programs was created to coordinate and improve writing instruction offered on campus. In its first year, Writing Programs, with its staff of eight, assessed campus needs and set directions for the program. In its second year, Writing Programs and the newly created Composition Section, a subdepartment of English, began offering new courses—and more sections—at both undergraduate and graduate levels. And as soon as we had made these beginnings, we re-evaluated the freshman courses, the foundation of any writing program. In many ways the history of this review is the history of Writing Programs, and this report will significantly influence that larger history.

I. Reasons for the Review

We undertook the review for pedagogical, cultural, and administrative reasons. Given a rapid increase of research in writing and a "quiet revolution" in composition theory, an institution would be remiss if it didn't review its traditional composition program. Review also seemed warranted because, in line with advances or not, the courses within UCLA's own program had not been conceptually and practically consistent. Further, given changing demographics and growing concern about the literacy crisis, the program needed expanding and reshaping to serve its student population and address new cultural and social realities. And review became possible because for the first time UCLA made unusual resources available, establishing an office to coordinate not only the freshman writing program but all writing instruction on campus, providing funding to offer more and better instruction, and encouraging development and review.

Pedagogical. The field of composition is changing dramatically. Some 15 years ago, the study of composition was bounded by the fields of education, rhetoric, and grammar. Now research adds linguistics, cognitive psychology, neurology, sociobiology, and of course literary criticism. Though it may be premature to talk about the change as the formation of a new paradigm, a major shift is occurring. It parallels the broader shift from a search for objective truth to the study of how we transform experience through symbol-manipulation. The implications for composition are obvious: we make meaning as well as find it through language.

Theorists and researchers, attending to what happens when we write, have substantially altered the way composition is taught. Many now recommend exercises in "prewriting" and "postwriting" (revising and editing, often with peer assistance). Ken Macrorie and Peter Elbow, for example, advocate freewriting and the use of journals to stimulate writers. Richard Young and Linda Flower have provided systematic techniques for prewriting in class. And, William Coles, in his book of classroom dialogue, also shows how to lead classes into academic inquiry.

Classes now should also allow for planning stages appropriate to different organizing strategies: some writers plan mainly in their heads and write almost paragraph-perfect essays; most writers need drafts to see where their thoughts lead them; others move from data to tentative outline to draft to filling in gaps to re-forming outlines.

Further, style should now be taught, not belletristically, but as accommodation to an audience: "Style is ingratiation," says Kenneth Burke. Style no longer means just reference to high, middle, or low, nor to formal versus informal, but the whole complex of shape, rhythm, tone, syntactic fluency, and the need to "tighten, brighten and sharpen"

(John Trimble's terms).

Finally, the writing class should become a workshop rather than a lecture hall. Talking about writing doesn't teach, and neither does the assignment-essay-grading series. Teachers should now try to mediate before final products are placed in their hands. Students can learn strategies to guide the entire writing process from idea to text to revision, thus sparing the teacher the dismally correct, shallow papers of previous years. (For teaching materials and samples, please see Appendix 4.)

Cultural. Pressure for reassessment also came from the increasingly polyglot nature of Southern California. Already, more than half the first graders in the 300 elementary schools of Los Angeles Unified School District are Hispanic. In spring 1981, an English 1 class of seventeen students spoke twelve different first languages, including Korean, Tagalog, Runyankore, Farsi, Hungarian, and Armenian. More ethnic groups live in Los Angeles than anywhere in the world and UCLA draws large numbers of local students.

As Richard Lanham summed up in his report to the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS):

— UCLA is a local institution with 90% of its freshmen coming from California. The state's problems and LA's problems are ours.

— Southern California's ethnic composition is rapidly changing. Current twelfth grade classes are 40% Black and Hispanic; 8% of UCLA's student body is Black and Hispanic.

Only the full faculty, Lanham argues, can spend the extra teaching effort these students need in every discipline. And with literacy the crucial element, writing teachers have a special mandate to encourage and prepare students for other university work. We must, then, better understand cultural differences, considering especially motivation and cognitive style, and develop more efficient teaching techniques for students new to the language.

Administrative. The need—and the opportunity—for review also came from administrative changes on our campus. UCLA Writing Programs and the Composition Section of the English Department had been given major responsibility for writing instruction offered on campus. In addition, we were reaching the end of the current Subject A administration: Everett Jones, who had directed Subject A for 35 years, was scheduled to retire at the end of 1981-82. Major administrative change always promotes self-examination and decision: we could make structural changes, or even personnel appointments, only by considering very carefully the aims and nature of the program involved.

In this context, other characteristics of the program also made review compelling. The program which had served the university well for a number of years itself invited review. English A, 1, and 3 had a checkered history of being now related, now separated—administratively and, inevitably, pedagogically as well. The testing procedures that had been carefully developed, with ETS's assistance, suited English A and 1, but served English 3 less well: developed as placement and evaluation devices which fit the instruction offered in English A and 1, they could not predict students' performance in English 3. In fact, they may have reinforced the differences between English 3 and the courses preceding it. The TA training program prepared TAs to teach English 3, their first assignment, but offered less direct support when they entered the

English 1 classroom.

Although the program had been growing, it had not developed quickly enough to handle increasing admissions. Very simply, in the spring of 1980 we calculated that 2,400 students had been unable to enroll in English 3 as freshmen and that many more students would be added to that backlog the following year. We regularly failed to offer enough sections for the freshman class alone, and certainly we never offered enough to serve continuing or transfer students. As a result, we were not preparing our students for university writing.

Further, we were not reviewing—we could not possibly adjust—our classes to meet the needs of growing minority populations: we had added English A, an appropriate remedial class, and we had begun experimenting with special classes in the Freshman Preparatory Program, which grew from a strong Freshman Summer Program, but we had not found ways of incorporating related changes into the rest of the freshman program.

And, finally, given the limits of the TA training program, we were not offering our TAs continuing support and keeping them informed of developments in composition theory and pedagogy. Though we had begun hiring Visiting Lecturers and offering them staff seminars, we had not yet fully developed Writing Programs training, nor had we brought the Lecturers and TAs together to study and discuss composition.

II. Earlier In-House Research

Though formal review of UCLA's composition program began in January 1981, earlier ad hoc administrative efforts led to studies that provided a good deal of information about writing at UCLA. Before mounting the first Freshman Summer Program in 1977 (and the first Freshman Preparatory Program in 1980), Mike Rose formed study groups to review current composition research and to assess the composition needs of UCLA students. In 1978, Vice-Chancellor John C. Ries called for the formation of the Writing Research Project. This group—composed of faculty and staff from English, Psychology, the Academic Advancement Program (AAP), and the Learning Skills Center—conducted interdisciplinary research on the composing process, rhetorical theory, and the nature of university discourse. And, when he was appointed Director of Writing Programs in 1980, Richard Lanham dispatched various staff members to investigate the frequency and kinds of writing assigned at UCLA.

Such study lays a base for program review. Fortunately, in addition, UCLA's two preparatory programs, the Freshman Summer Program (FSP) and the Freshman Preparatory Program (FP^2), had developed into informal curriculum laboratories, places where approaches suggested by new research and in-house studies could be tested in the classroom, and their appropriateness to UCLA's needs determined.

The Freshman Summer Program (FSP) is a preparatory program for students who are about to enter UCLA but who have performed poorly on the SAT or CEEB or on university diagnostic examinations. It runs for six and one half weeks in the summer before the students' fall quarter. The FSP composition component is built on the "adjunct" model; that is, students are enrolled in a "content area" course like political science or history and, in conjunction, take a writing course. These two courses are coordinated so that content material informs writing topics and writing is seen as an integral part of the content course. This sort of cross-breeding provides students with substantial academic topics. They learn to write for university audiences as they must, for example, classify or compare or analyze data, events, phenomena, theories. There

are few questions about relevance here: students realize quickly that the better they can communicate their knowledge through writing, the more successful they will be, not only in English but in their breadth course as well. Further, this approach encourages the use of writing as "a mode of learning." Students' understanding of content area material is enhanced as they try to organize it and convey it to others.

UCLA also offers in the Freshman Preparatory Program (FP^2) a series of composition classes that extend throughout the freshman year. This program attempts a fuller simulation, within the classroom, of the academic writing environments that exist across the university.

FP^2 is special in two ways: its "external" structure and its curriculum. Structually, FP^2 classes are different from regular composition classes in that they run two hours per day rather than one, are tightly sequenced so that students must take them consecutively, are taught by the same instructor each quarter, and are supplemented with tutorials. Curricularly, FP^2 classes attempt a simulation of university writing demands in the following ways: A) Surveys of academic writing tasks suggested that a number of global discourse strategies or structures are central to academic writing. These strategies become the curricular base of FP^2. Beginning with English A, students are given assignments that require definition and the presentation of elements in a series. By the time they finish English 3, FP^2 students are required to analyze and argue. B) Most FP^2 assignments require the student to work from texts. FP^2 teachers rely on a 200-page compilation of materials from virtually every major campus discipline, astronomy to literature. Students receive an introduction to the way various disciplines segment knowledge and represent that knowledge in writing. Likewise, they learn how to draw evidence from texts and weave it into their own arguments.

As in FSP, students engage in these academic writing tasks through new paradigm approaches and techniques. Their classes emphasize recursive pre-writing, writing, and re-writing strategies.

III. Nature of the Review

In January 1981, Writing Programs named this planning committee: Susan Brienza, Mary Georges, Michael Moore, Mike Rose, Jennifer Wilson, and Carol Hartzog, Chair. Its charge was to assess the entire freshman writing program, considering both administration and curriculum in every detail. Before June 1981, this committee had held open forums for instructors of English 1 and 3, surveyed students who had taken English 3, collected English 3 syllabi, articulated the program's goals in response to a survey conducted by the University of Texas, Austin, and begun dealing with placement issues. In addition, a sub-committee chaired by Virginia Hornak had developed a personal data form for English A and 1 students, and Jennifer Wilson, working with Ruth Gibbs and Tom Fry from the library, had developed a library project for English 3.

In the fall of 1981, a new committee was named to continue directing the review and to prepare a final report: Cheryl Bolin, Susan Brienza, Pat Taylor, and Mike Rose and Carol Hartzog, Co-Chairs. During the year, this committee established and advised 12 sub-committees investigating particular issues, from testing through curriculum and evaluation.

(For a detailed record of the review, please see Appendices 1-3.)

IV. Administrative Changes

As we have reviewed the freshman program, we have made these changes in administrative structure, the composition requirement, and course offerings and descriptions:

(1) Administrative Reorganization. Acting on our agreement that the freshman courses should be united under one administration, the Composition Section Advisory Board has created the position of Director of the Freshman Writing Program and, with the approval of the Executive Committee of the English Department and the administration, appointed Mike Rose to hold that position. He will be assisted by a TA coordinator, Jennifer Bradley.

(2) Subject A Department. With the administrative and curricular changes we are making, Subject A will no longer exist as a separate department. The Director and instructors will serve all freshman writing courses and the office staff will take on new responsibilities. Therefore, the central office will now be identified as the Freshman Writing Program rather than as Subject A.

(3) Testing and Advising. We have appointed a Testing Coordinator and English 3 Advisor for 1982-83. George Gadda will plan and supervise all placement, mid-term, and final exams administered in English A and 1. In addition, he will advise students on enrollment in English 3.

(4) Three-quarter Requirement. The review has led to the proposal, already endorsed by the College of Letters and Science and the Academic Senate, that its students should satisfy the composition requirement within the first three quarters of residence. This decision, now being reported to the statewide Assembly, will become effective in the fall of 1983.

(5) Special Sections of English 3. Acting on our committees' recommendations, we are discontinuing special sections of English 3 for Fine Arts, Life Science, Social Science, and English Literature. We are, however, placing level restrictions on all sections of English 3, so that some sections will be reserved for entering freshmen, others for advanced students.

(6) Library Project. We have discontinued using a library skills workbook in English 1, and we are working with UCLA librarians to develop alternative research projects for English 3. (See Appendix 4.) A short slide-tape on search strategies will be available fall quarter 1982.

(7) Course Titles and Numbers. We recommend changing the titles of the first two courses in the freshman sequence to Fundamental Exposition and Introduction to Academic Discourse. We further recommend renumbering these courses (currently English A and 1) to English 1 and 2. These courses will lead directly to English 3, and their numbers should indicate sequence rather than discontinuity. This series was not chosen when the courses were renumbered a few years ago simply to avoid confusion with the old English 2 (now English 4), Critical Reading and Writing. Enough years have passed now to eliminate that problem.

(8) Course Descriptions. We recommend that course descriptions be revised. (See pages 11-12 below, for the revised copy.)

(9) Student Data. We have recommended changes in the Admissions System (AMS) and Student Record System (SRS) codes, so that we can begin tracking our students carefully. We are also developing computer programs for collecting data from all students taking the placement exam and for reporting their scores and advising them on enrollment.

V. The Proposed Freshman Writing Program

We want to establish a program-wide curriculum that will offer guidelines to all faculty without stifling creativity or personal involvement. To make our courses coherent while allowing a good deal of freedom, we propose general principles, various curricula embodying them, and a set of goals for each course.

General Principles

All teachers of composition need to view the field as being in a state of inquiry. Our knowledge of the production of written discourse, the motives behind it, and the influence of social context upon it is clearly still evolving. And as our knowledge develops, it becomes increasingly clear that a single orientation, a single set of techniques will not reveal the complexities of composing. Therefore, we need to explore fields as diverse as rhetoric and anthropology, stylistics and cognitive psychology in order to understand writing and to best serve our linguistically and ethnically diverse student population. Our principles:

(1) Writing must be taught as a vital process that aids the storing, structuring, discovering, and re-visioning of information for self and others, a process central to our attempts to make sense of the world.

(2) University students must learn to write the kind of discourse that is central to academic inquiry.

(3) When possible, writing assignments should be built on the kinds of materials students encounter at the university. This approach will contribute to the interpretive skills students must have and, as well, provide an introduction to thinking and writing across the disciplines.

(4) The most efficient writing curriculum is one in which classes build sequentially each on the other as do specific writing assignments within each class.

(5) When possible, grammar and mechanics should not be taught in isolation. Rather, this instruction should be woven into the writing students do, provided through indirect methods like stylistic imitation, or offered individually in conferences and tutorials.

(6) Composition instructors must encourage their students to try new words, new syntactical patterns, new rhetorical devices; a dogged insistence on correctness might well stifle linguistic exploration.

(7) Motivation and intelligence ought to be expected of university-level students. Writing curricula, then, should challenge the student, even in a "basic" course, for high expectations often contribute to high performance.

(8) Instruction in stylistics and rhetoric should be incorporated into all composition courses, basic topics being taught from the beginning of the most basic course.

(9) Many composition students are hampered by limited vocabulary. Vocabulary-building exercises therefore, should be part of the writing curriculum, particularly at the more fundamental level.

(10) Close reading of selected texts should be an important part of the writing curriculum.

Curriculum

(Note: English A and 1 have here been renumbered English 1 and 2.)

ENGLISH 1

English 1 is a course in reading and writing academic discourse. Students work with relatively simple academic material: teachers provide some instruction in reading and assist the students in close reading of the texts. Students work individually and in groups, writing paraphrases and simple summaries of what they read, commenting orally and in writing on the material, discussing strategies for understanding academic texts. Writing assignments are closely tied to the readings. And while the teacher may initially assign composition topics that require students to reflect on personal experience, topics should become increasingly academic in nature as the course progresses. In special cases, students might be assigned to the Academic Advancement Program (AAP), the Academic Resources Center (ARC), or the Fernald School tutorials as part of their English 1 work.

ENGLISH 2 and 3

Some of the curricula summarized below can be modified to fit either English 2 or 3; others as indicated, are more appropriate for one course or the other. All five are based on process approaches: instructors stress formulating and planning as well as revising discourse, relegate error-hunting to editing, and assist students while they're writing rather than simply grading papers after the fact. We do not mean this emphasis on process to constrain teaching style: some instructors may rely on peer editing groups, others on class discussion. Some may evaluate papers during conferencing, others in more traditional ways.

A Course in Autobiography - From Personal to Academic Writing. In this curriculum, students turn their own experience into the subject matter of academic investigation. Students move from personal autobiography to examining the autobiography of others and do so along James Moffett's discourse continuum which directs them from simple reporting to more complex generalizing. David Bartholomae, one of the curriculum's creators, explains the curriculum thus:

> The students write a series of papers that describe a change that has occurred in their lives in the last two or three years in order to draw conclusions about how change occurs in adolescence. These papers lead up to a longer autobiographical essay that asks them to draw some conclusions about change in general. At the same time, they are reading autobiographical accounts of children and young adults caught up in change—Margaret Mead in Blackberry Winter, Maya Angelou in I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings, Holden Caufield in Catcher in the Rye and Huck in

Huckleberry Finn. The autobiographical essays are reproduced, bound together, and offered to the class as the next text in the series of assigned readings. Students read the autobiographies in order to report, in writing, on what they see to be the significant patterns—common themes and experiences or contradictory themes and experiences—and to provide names or labels for those patterns. They do this in order to go on to speculate, in general, on the ways adolescents change and the kinds of changes that occur. The next set of assignments directs them to the first half of Gail Sheehy's Passages, where they see her involved in an identical process of inquiry, report, labeling and speculation. As writers, they are asked to go back to reconsider the autobiographies, this time using Sheehy's labels as well as their own. The last two books for the course are Edgar Friedenberg's The Vanishing Adolescent and Margaret Mead's Coming of Age in Samoa.

The point of the sequence is to allow students to reconsider the positions they have achieved in their own study of adolescence by defining new positions in relation to the more formal representations of psychologists and anthropologists. But their own attempts to categorize and label provide the source of their understanding of Sheehy, Friedenberg, and Mead. ("Teaching Basic Writing: An Alternative to Basic Skills", Journal of Basic Writing, V. 2. [Spring/Summer, 1979], pp. 85-109)

Though Bartholomae takes issue with "lessons on the structure of academic prose," it is important to note that his students, in fact, are guided through reporting (and thus serial presentation of events) to finding common or contradictory patterns (and thus classification and comparison/contrast) and then to labeling and exploring with the aid of the psychologist's and anthropologist's terminology (and thus analysis). (This course was developed by Anthony Petrosky and David Bartholomae at the University of Pittsburgh. We recommend it for English 2.)

The Freshman Preparatory Program Curriculum. Writing at the university becomes not only the basis of the curriculum but an object of study itself. Students are given excerpts, and some fuller pieces, from a number of different disciplines. They read these materials not as "prose models," but as representative samples of academic writing that contain information. Their assignments—short in-class exercises to help them master a rhetorical strategy as well as full, out-of-class papers—nearly all require a close examination of these texts and the use of information from them. Writing assignments follow this, admittedly incomplete, hierarchy of expository schemes: definition, seriation, classification, summary, compare/contrast, analysis, academic argument. More complex forms of earlier schemes can incorporate previously learned strategies. For example, after students have learned how to sequence elements in a series, classify, and summarize, the teacher can assign extended definition topics that require the ability to detail a process, classify, and summarize. These expository schemes are taught both as investigative strategies and rhetorical patterns. At appropriate points in the curriculum, students study the methodological, formal, and stylistic conventions of different kinds of academic discourse. (This curriculum is recommended for either English 2 or 3. In English 2, the instructor would cover definition, seriation, classification, summary, and simple comparison. In English 3, he or she would begin with summary and also cover contrast, analysis, and academic argument.)

The Project Workshop. The course is built around 3 or 4 projects that require students to do a good deal of investigative research. Students select topics from fairly general lists provided by the teacher and write a number of papers, many of which

contribute to the longer project papers. (For example, students might be required to produce an annotated bibliography of sources to be used in a project paper.) Discourse strategies are not as tightly sequenced as in most of the other curricula presented here, but are introduced as they become appropriate to the projects. The classroom becomes a kind of hybrid writing lab/seminar in which students work on their projects together and with the teacher, present progress reports, and discuss what they're learning about the nature of research. Our thanks to Faye Peitzman for her assistance with this curriculum. (Recommended for English 2 or 3.)

The Cross-Disciplinary Theme-Centered Course. As in the Preparatory Program curriculum, students write from texts, but the texts all deal with one central theme. There aren't as many excerpts of texts as there are in the Preparatory Program curriculum; the texts are fuller, though they still come from a number of disciplines. Such a course has been developed by Visiting Lecturer Mike Gustin. Gustin's course, entitled "Insiders and Outsiders," explores human and non-human systems, focusing on the way participants are included or excluded. His course materials range from One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest, excerpts from Goffman's Asylums and other sociological analyses of deviance to passages from Edward Ricketts' Between Pacific Tides and other discussions of marine ecological systems. Assignments are carefully sequenced so that students learn strategies of academic discourse, and definition becomes somewhat of a focus as strategies like classifying and comparing are subsumed under attempts to create extended definitions of "insider" and "outsider." Stylistic/rhetorical assignments can, as in the Preparatory Program, be based on varieties of academic prose or can be more exclusively derived from the students' own writing. (Recommended for English 3.)

Cross-Cultural Readings Curriculum. Readings for this curriculum consist of some combination of fiction from Central and Latin America, Asia, and Africa, as well as excerpts from appropriate sources in political science, anthropology, history, sociology, and psychology. This is not a literature course, but rather a writing course that builds assignments from literary and social science texts. Expository strategies would be treated, though not necessarily in the fashion prescribed in the Preparatory Program curriculum. Topics would not be the ones traditional to literary analysis. Rather, they would require the student to focus on cultural issues, using the perspectives offered by literature or social science. Our thanks to Ruth Mitchell and Dianne Dugaw for their assistance with this curriculum. (Recommended for English 3.)

Goals

Considering our initial principles and the curricula that derive from them, we can establish five broad goals. A teacher is free to choose from the models and is further free to choose his or her pedagogic and evaluation techniques. Whatever blend the teacher chooses, he or she should achieve the following goals.

ENGLISH 1

Process. Students will come to see writing as a process that reflects and aids thinking. Expressive writing will be directed to academic purposes. Observing and reporting will lead to higher-level generalizing and theorizing. Students will understand the nature and purposes of such discourse.

Expository Strategies. Students will initially narrate and report, then practice paraphrase and summary and advance toward generalizing and theorizing. They will understand the differences between oral and written modes.

Reading. Students will spend a good deal of time on reading and related writing assignments. They will develop the ability not just to narrate and report on their

reading, but to paraphrase and comment on it.

Style. Through sentence-combining, imitation, and other exercises, students will learn to produce sentences of varied complexity. Their writing as well as their reading will help them understand rhetorical aims and strategies.

Correctness. Though English 1 should not be reduced to a course in error recognition and editing, students will be guided toward eliminating major grammatical/mechanical (particularly sentence construction) errors from their writing.

ENGLISH 2

Process. Students will develop appropriate composing behaviors: for example, they will have various planning and organizing strategies, they will be able to compose with some flexibility, and they will be able to revise as well as edit, incorporating student and teacher feedback.

Expository Strategies. Students will show facility with fundamental expository strategies, presenting items and events in a series, classifying, summarizing, comparing and contrasting. They will know how to develop these strategies with appropriate evidence and how to combine them for complex purposes.

Reading. Students will display relative facility at close reading of texts and at determining passages' main points and summarizing them. They will gain facility at reading for thesis as well as for structure and detail. They will also show some understanding of and facility with the vocabulary of academic discourse.

Style. Students will be able to produce relatively complex sentences and will display some sense of their appropriateness as well as of the rhetorical necessity of varying sentence length. They will also show some ability with rhetorical devices, and some sensitivity to manipulation of tone.

Correctness. Students will be able to write relatively correct prose clear of major problems that interfere with comprehension.

ENGLISH 3

Process. Students will display composing behaviors similar to those listed for English 2, but will enact them in a more sophisticated manner. Their reorganizations will be more global, and their revisions more numerous.

Expository Strategies. Students will display facility with relatively sophisticated expository strategies (comparing and contrasting, and analyzing) and with academic argumentation. Students will know how to develop these strategies with appropriate evidence and how to combine them for complex purposes.

Reading. Students will display facility at reading texts closely and using the vocabulary of academic discourse. They will understand how conventions of presenting and inferring from evidence vary across disciplines.

Research. Students will have some introduction to academic research, so that they are familiar with the UCLA Library and know how to find, use, and document appropriate sources of information.

Style. To sharpen and enliven their prose, students will display ability to manipulate selected rhetorical devices and suit tone to audience. Their syntactic fluency and ability to vary sentence length will be relatively sophisticated.

Correctness. Students will have control over major and most minor problems of correctness. They will have some understanding of linguistic and sociolinguistic reasons for conventions of grammar and usage.

Course Descriptions

English 1 and 2 satisfy the Subject A requirement, English 3 the composition requirement. (Most students held for Subject A will take only English 2; those needing more than 1 quarter's preparation will take both English 1 and 2.)

ENGLISH 1: FUNDAMENTAL EXPOSITION

English 1 is a preliminary course in reading and writing academic discourse. Students are introduced to academic writing and assisted in developing appropriate reading strategies for that writing. They practice the kinds of writing (e.g., paraphrasing and summarizing) that enhance reading ability. When applicable, English 1 teaches grammar and mechanics through the students' writing or, indirectly, through methods like stylistic imitation.

ENGLISH 2: INTRODUCTION TO ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

English 2 introduces students to the conventions of academic discourse and to planning, organizing, and revising strategies necessary for producing that discourse. Students learn to vary sentence length, diction, and tone according to purpose and audience. When appropriate, English 2 teaches grammar and mechanics through the students' writing or, indirectly, through methods like stylistic imitation.

ENGLISH 3: ENGLISH COMPOSITION: RHETORIC AND LANGUAGE

English 3 introduces students to sophisticated strategies of academic discourse, most notably analysis and argument. Academic discourse itself becomes an object of investigation as students learn how conventions of reasoning and writing vary across disciplines. The "verbal surface" of prose becomes a major concern as students analyze texts and develop their own writing skills.

Textbooks

A textbook committee will review and recommend appropriate texts for all freshman courses each year. In addition, this committee will consider developing materials specific to UCLA and making them available to instructors through computer files.

Testing

We have developed and begun using a new Subject A exam, closely related to the courses described above and to other university writing. Earlier, the Subject A exam relied on topics unlike those encountered elsewhere at the university. These topics asked the student to reflect on personal experience or to express opinions on general social issues. They were not academic and were not based on reading materials. The new exam

includes one such topic, but includes as well a topic requiring that the student work from an attached prose passage and demonstrate skills in analyzing or arguing. The exam was used successfully in Orientation during summer of 1981 and instituted as the regular placement exam in May 1982.

Section VI. Recommendations

Course Offerings and Requirements

Although all students should take at least two quarters of freshman writing, we are not now proposing a two-quarter requirement. Our students will soon begin satisfying the composition requirement as freshmen, and we have already received generous administrative support, allowing us to schedule and staff the number of sections we will need in 1982-83. For at least two years we will need to offer enough sections not only for entering students, but also for the backlog of continuing students who have not yet completed the composition requirement. Our first aim, then, is to eliminate the backlog and at the same time to begin moving students smoothly through the freshman sequence.

During the two years it will take us to handle these enrollment problems, we will also be developing the curriculum outlined above. By doing so, we will establish a solid freshman program which will prepare students for university study and for advanced writing courses. At the same time, we will continue developing our upper-division courses—English 100W (Intensive Writing), 131 (Exposition), and 136ABC (Practical Writing and Editing)—so that they will build firmly on the freshman courses and relate logically to one another. We will then be able to present a strong upper-division program as well. Above it, our graduate offerings should also be evolving into a stable, important program, again logically related to each of the programs beneath it.

At the end of two years, then, with the backlog controlled and freshman enrollments regulated and stable, we should be able to divert some resources into other writing courses. We will have two choices: more students—ideally, all—could be held for the course preceding English 3, or more students could be admitted into our advanced courses. Rather than making that choice now, we recommend waiting and watching all our programs develop. We incline now toward the first choice, reasoning that 10 weeks is not enough, that all students need at least two quarters of freshman writing. However, we also know that freshman writing is not enough, that, as Albert Kitzhaber demonstrated some years ago, students need training as juniors or seniors or they will lose the writing skills they had as freshmen. And they also need training for writing in their major fields.

As we improve the advanced courses we offer now (already over-subscribed), and as we propose new ones, we will attract more students. A majority of students answering our English 3 survey indicated that they thought an advanced writing course beyond 3 should be recommended or required, and, more surprising, that they would elect to take an advanced composition course even if it were not required. And the new program for business and administation, available fall 1982, will begin to channel students into these classes as well. We may find that we will have developed the options and demonstrated the need for requiring all students to take at least one quarter beyond English 3. Ideally, of course, all students should take both two freshman courses and at least one advanced course. But we expect to face the same constraints in two years that we face now—cost, staff, and space—so we will see where the ideal meets the real before making our next proposal.

Development and Review

We plan to incorporate the changes outlined and ensure the program's continuing development and review in these ways:

Teaching Assignments. We will follow the plan for making teaching assignments developed in 1981-82 : all Lecturers hired in our program will teach at least one course in the freshman program and at least one advanced course. Ideally, everyone should teach both English 2 and 3 and two sections of an Intensive (English 100W) or English 131 each year. While we were reviewing the freshman program, we reduced all our Lecturers' course loads to 6, to give them time for course and program development, and we will continue this policy.

Orientation. In September each year we hold a one-week orientation for all Writing Programs Lecturers. This year we will begin offering concurrent sessions dealing with specialized areas or issues, and we will invite TAs to participate in meetings relevant to their teaching or interests. We will also begin using documents generated by this review: the description of the proposed freshman program, for example, will become part of an instructor's guide we are preparing.

Training. As we emphasize the composing process, we'll have to provide training in process approaches and introduce teachers to the process research underlying these approaches. Among other things, we will orient TAs and Lecturers to conferencing and peer editing—two different approaches that both lead to students envisioning writing as an on-going, unfolding act. Teachers can then decide which approach best suits their style. The English Department has voted to reverse its graduate course sequence starting in 1983 so that new TAs will get a practical workshop first and later a theory course. Other, more technical, training is needed as well—at least in two general areas. Our teachers must learn more about evaluation and its effects on student performance. And, given the L.A. basin's changing demography, our teachers must be exposed to ESL techniques and to methods for diagnosing and remedying profound written language problems.

Committees. In their final reports, a number of this year's committees recommended that they should continue next year. Thus, we will invite membership on these committees:

A. Curriculum and Texts. To develop the curriculum, primarily by collecting and organizing UCLA materials to supplement or replace current texts, and secondarily to review new texts as they appear.

B. Evaluation. To set standards for the freshman courses and to guide discussion of current evaluation theories and strategies.

C. Training. To continue developing the in-service training program offered to Writing Programs Lecturers and to coordinate it with the English Department's TA training program.

D. Research. To encourage research in writing and to advise the staff of current developments in composition theory and pedagogy.

Courses. We will develop and propose new courses recommended by our standing committees. First, we plan to consider an intermediate, field-specific course which the Special Sections Committee has suggested to replace the sections of English 3 offered

previously for students interested in Fine Arts, Social Sciences, Life Sciences, and English.

Review. By drawing nearly all of our Lecturers into close conversation on the problems and possibilities before us, the current review has become a form of in-service training and thus has itself become the catalyst for change. This report grows directly out of our Lecturers' experience in the classroom, their concerns and debates, and their own research. Our instructors are incorporating the best of current composition theory into their classes. As one lecturer recently wrote:

> We are doing all that researchers and theorists tell us we should be doing: we encourage composition-as-process models and we encourage stylistic suppleness as an acquired skill; we study cognitive process, learning what happens, how error dovetails with learning to think and to communicate, and what we can't at present know about knowing; we try to understand the complex relations between our . . . students' sense of goal attainment and our own sense (as graders) of fairness and quality, and acknowledging that our fatigue sometimes collides with our commitment, we try to synthesize all that encouragement, study and understanding without giving mixed signals to the students in our care. (Jennifer Bradley)

Just as the current review has already generated change, we want the new program to bring with it continuing review. We view this program not as a machine, which we can fix by replacing parts, but as an organic whole, which will change and grow with us. We have an excellent faculty appointed for 1982-83: those who have identified the need for changes will help us make them. We will ask our committees to continue assessing our work and advising us. The new Director, TA Coordinator, and Testing Coordinator will lead in effecting change, self-consciously and critically. In addition, we plan to investigate means of evaluating writing programs by consulting with Vivian Freedman of the Office of Instructional Development locally and by staying in touch with the faculty at the University of Texas, Austin, engaged in a three-year national study of that topic.

VII. Projections

As we move into the next phase of program development and review, three major issues concern us, all complex and all related. We cannot solve these problems now, and we can never solve them alone, but we can give them priority and suggest how we might approach them.

Bilingual and Second-Language Students. Throughout our review, we have been conscious that our program must react to cultural and demographic change. As more bilingual and second-language students enter our classes, we expect to serve them in these ways: English 1 (renumbered from English A) can accommodate special cases because it has unusual flexibility, addressing the particular needs of the students in each section. We will encourage these students to seek tutoring and will support all tutorial programs on campus. In addition, we plan to study placement problems and continue reclassifying students after they have written diagnostic exams. We plan also to give attention to this issue in hiring and training our Lecturers.

On a larger scale, we hope to work closely with other departments—particularly English as a Second Language and Asian Studies—to develop joint research projects and plans.

Freshman Preparatory Program. This experimental program, entering its third year in 1982-83, will soon face review and decision. The writing component clearly seems successful: its curriculum has influenced the freshman program now evolving, and its students have demonstrated appropriate success in these courses and in English 4. It seems reasonable now to consider expanding the program and, further, viewing it as an important link between the freshman writing program and ESL.

We will bring our FP^2 and English 1 instructors together to compare their courses and students and to consider whether soon all English 1 students should be channeled into FP^2, for continuing support throughout the freshman writing sequence. As we accumulate more complete student data, we can trace particular students and particular types of students, to study their achievement both in our courses and in others. This information will also help us with these decisions.

Remediation. Both ESL and FP^2 are university responses to the need for remediation. Similarly, Subject A is often considered remedial. Yet the term—and the subject—continue to be seriously debated. The University of California has not yet reached agreement. The University English Council at its April 1982 meeting resolved that "Subject A work is not remediation, but part of the regular university curriculum in English composition," arguing that these courses should therefore be restored as distinct line items in the university budget. At the same time, the Intersegmental Report urges that credit should be removed from Subject A instruction.

We support the University English Council's position, particularly after completing this review of our freshman courses. We strongly feel that students should receive not less, but more, credit for taking the new English 1 and 2, and we will propose such a change to the Committee on Undergraduate Courses and Curricula in 1982-83.

Remediation and second-language instruction are complex and pressing issues now facing us and other institutions across the country. We can address them only cooperatively. Just as we involved our faculty in this review, we intend to work closely with other departments and campuses to solve remaining problems. In outlining a new freshman program, we have valued above all flexibility and stability, and these characteristics will help us respond to the challenges yet before us, challenges that are cultural and social as well as academic.

Appendix 1. History of the Review

In January 1981, Writing Programs named this planning committee: Susan Brienza, Mary Georges, Michael Moore, Mike Rose, Jennifer Wilson, and Carol Hartzog, Chair. Its charge was to assess the entire freshman writing program, considering each of these elements:

- Sequence
  - Requirement, numbering
  - Nature of each course
  - English as a Second Language (ESL)
  - Freshman Preparatory Program (FP^2)
  - Honors
- Curricula
  - Form and content
  - Consistency
  - Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI)
  - Computer literacy
- Testing
- Grading
  - Grade inflation
  - Group grading
  - Attendance
- Materials
  - Texts
  - Files - Vugraphs
  - Library - texts, composition resources
  - Media programs
- Training/evaluation
  - English 275. Stylistics and the Teaching of English
  - English 495. Supervised Teacher Preparation
  - Workshops
  - Peer visiting
- Administration
  - Structure
  - Enrollment control - backlog and sequencing
  - Ethnic census
  - Offices

The committee, meeting weekly for the rest of the year, set these priorities:

1. To survey students who have taken the freshman courses
2. To meet with instructors in open forums
3. To collect syllabi and final exams
4. To articulate general assumptions about how the courses and the programs should be improved
5. To consider other departments' needs and expectations (see Susan Fletcher's campus survey, 1979-80)

And the committee proceeded in this way:

Instructors. We held open forums for instructors of English 1 and then of English 3. As a result of these discussions, the Subject A instructors also held two coffee hours.

Students. We surveyed 900 students who had taken English 3, and we began using an English A and 1 Personal Data Form, developed by Virginia Hornak and her committee.

Curricula. First, we began concentrating on the freshman courses simply as a result of the year's teaching assignments: although we had originally hired two separate staffs, Writing Programs and Composition Section, this year the two were merged. We reduced the course load to 6 for all instructors, to allow for course and program development—specifically in the freshman program. And we varied teaching assignments, so that everyone taught at least one course outside the freshman program and nearly everyone taught at least one course within it.

In addition, working with Ruth Gibbs and Tom Fry from the library, we developed a library project for English 3. Jennifer Wilson ably supervised this project. We also began collecting English 3 syllabi, and textbook committees for English 1 and 3 reviewed current texts and recommended texts for the coming year.

Goals. Responding to a survey conducted by the University of Texas, Austin, we reviewed our program and stated our real and ideal goals. Carol Hartzog responded for the program administration and David Ward and Pat Hunt responded for the instructors.

Placement. We began dealing with placement problems by talking with Gloria Nathanson from Admissions, Melinda Erickson from ESL, and Pauline Ward from Subject A. We agreed that we should try to adopt the system Mrs. Ward had already informally established for reclassifying students on the basis of their Subject A placement exams.

During the year, we effected these changes:

1. The Composition Section was established within the university as a sub-department of English, so that scheduling and publications would be handled by the Composition Section/Writing Programs office.

2. Working with Paula Faulkner, we recommended changes in the Admissions and Student Record System codes, indicating whether ESL, Subject A, and for the first time the composition requirement are required or have been satisfied.

3. We began placing Notices on the study lists of English 1 students, advising them to satisfy the composition requirement immediately after passing English 1.

4. We received computer data on our students' enrollments and grades, so that we could begin analyzing patterns of enrollment and success.

5. We placed level 2 restrictions on several sections of English 3 to guarantee advanced-standing students places in English 3.

Research. Through our staff seminars and workshops we encouraged research into current composition theory and pedagogy. We also hired John McKee part-time to investigate writing programs nationally.

In fall 1981, we presented the results of our year's work in Orientation sessions for Writing Programs Lecturers. And we established a committee to continue planning and, finally, to write this report. Its members: Cheryl Bolin, Susan Brienza, Pat Taylor, and Mike Rose and Carol Hartzog, Co-Chairs.

What seemed clear was that, first of all, we needed to focus now on what our program might do, rather than simply finding fault with what it had been doing, and that, secondly, we needed to involve our faculty in the review process. As a result, we began the year by holding two workshops in which Carol Hartzog outlined alternative models—first suggesting that all entering students should be held for two quarters of instruction, and then suggesting that tutorial instruction should be offered not before an introductory course, but after it. The aim was to break away from our present courses, which could be improved without really correcting the situation, and to begin concentrating on what we might offer: given these new parameters, what could we do for our students and what form should our instruction take? Our Lecturers responded enthusiastically, imagining that students faced new requirements and that we had limitless resources for addressing their needs. These sessions worked as a transition into careful research and planning: from them emerged a dozen faculty committees which would spend the year dealing with particular issues and concerns that emerged naturally from our discussions.

We then set up these committees:

Training	Evaluation and Grades
Testing	Special Sections
Tutorial	Upper Divison
ESL	Conferencing
Student Information	Editing Guides
Curriculum	Research

(Committee members and their charges are presented in Appendix 2.)

The committees worked independently for a full quarter, meeting jointly or inviting other faculty or staff members to their meetings when appropriate, surveying current instructors of the freshman courses, contacting other colleges and universities, and reviewing the relevant literature. They presented interim reports, which we compared and discussed in a meeting of committee chairs and to which Mike Rose responded, raising questions or suggesting lines of investigation. Then the committees continued their work, culminating in final reports presented at the end of winter quarter (summarized in Appendix 3). After reviewing these reports, committee chairs met to take stock and to begin planning directly for next year. Several committees were continuing their research and one, the training committee, was waiting for these final reports and for results of a TA and lecturer survey to make firm recommendations.

Finally, the central A-1-3 Planning Commmittee collected all the information which 18 months had produced—through committee reports, open forums, and surveys—and assembled this report. The report itself had changed in conception: the committee was originally formed as the Proposal Committee, charged with writing and presenting a proposal for next year's freshman writing program. In the interim, however, the review has already generated significant changes. Thus we need not only to propose change but also to report it, to explain what is occurring and what is planned, and to suggest how this self-conscious review process can continue.

Appendix 2. Sub-Committee Members and Their Charges

A-1-3 Committees, 1981-82

Training
- Susan Brienza
- Pat Hunt
- Susan Fletcher
- Linda Venis

Testing
- George Gadda
- Bob Cullen
- Mal Kiniry
- Cynthia Tuell
- Ev Jones, advisor

Tutorial
- Judy Collas
- Don Wasson
- Mike Gustin
- Mike Smith

ESL
- Mary Georges
- Gary Colombo
- Ed Frankel
- Melinda Erickson

Student Information
- Virginia Hornak
- Stephen Miles
- Mitzi Myers

Curriculum and Textbooks
- Jeff Jeske
- Mike Moore
- Diane Durkin
- Tina Morgan
- Jeff Skoblow
- Michael Cohen (CAI)

Evaluation and Grades
- Jennifer Bradley
- Dan Hawkes
- Sonia Maasik

Special Sections, Lower Division
- Jennifer Wilson
- Pat Chittenden
- Susan Popkin
- Janette Lewis

Special Sections, Upper Division
- Erna Kelly
- Gary Colombo
- Lisa Gerrard
- Cheryl Giuliano
- Paul Schiffer

Conferencing
- Mike Havens
- Paul Douglass
- Judith Wagner
- Carol Edwards

Editing Guides
- Cheryl Bolin
- Charles Berezin
- Ellen Croen
- Alan Golding

Research
- Julie Bisceglia
- Faye Peitzman
- Jim Williams

A-1-3 Committee Charges, 1981-82

TRAINING

1) Survey English 275/495 students after they've taught for a few quarters. What has proved to be most helpful? Least helpful?

2) Should the committee's desire to establish guidelines for freshman instruction influence the 275/495 curriculum? That is, should a fairly standard syllabus be devised and recommended? What are the philosophical as well as practical problems here?

3) How closely should 275/495 instruction be coordinated with actual courses at various levels (freshman, upper division)?

4) Are there any practical activities TAs could be involved in during or before 275? Tutoring is one possibility; the ARC ESL training program is another.

5) What sort of in-service training program would best suit the lecturers? Survey them to see what they liked most and least about last year's seminar program. Investigate the possibility of certification. What do other schools do with such "post-doc" programs? What would an ideal certificating program include?

6) What sort of orientation program would best support our new freshman program? Should we offer special intensive pre-fall training? Should TAs be invited?

7) Is peer evaluation viable, helpful? What are other schools doing?

TESTING

1) Survey the testing and placement policies of selected institutions.

2) Read, summarize, and present a reasonable number of evaluation procedures. A good source book is Cooper and Odell's Evaluating Writing. Pat Taylor recommends a further volume, Davis and Scriven's The Evaluation of Composition Instruction.

3) This is more a soothing note than a recommendation. Understand that the evaluation of writing is the thorniest of issues in composition research. Therefore, this committee must be prepared for ambiguity and confusion. A most useful task would be for it to attempt a delineation of the areas most confusing vs. the areas where we can make statements with some certainty.

4) Testing makes sense only when it evolves from a coherent philosophy of composition. As the Planning Committee forges such a philosophy, the testing committee can assist by recommending appropriate evaluation procedures.

5) What do selected other institutions do with students who place very low or very high on their examinations? What do they do with marginal ESL students? With students with severe language problems? With reading problems?

6) What do selected other institutions do with students who fail their basic courses?

TUTORIALS

1) How can we best use tutorials in our freshman program?

2) Read and report on relevant literature. Jossey-Bass publishers would be one resource. Pat Taylor, Judy Collas, Betty Levinson, Marcella Graffin, and Donald Wasson are others.

3) How can we best acquaint all faculty with tutorial services? How can we encourage referrals? What do we have to do, programatically and pedagogically, to insure early referrals?

4) Are there other sources (in addition to English 131. Exposition) from which to recruit tutors?

5) Tutorial Centers are always trying to form relationships with faculty. In what ways can we form links with the Tutorial Centers?

6) Tutors could provide valuable insight into what a composition program is doing right and where it's running into trouble. How can we best involve tutors in program evaluation?

ESL

1) How are other schools dealing with the marginal second-language students?

2) Prepare a brief bibliography of selected articles for our instructors who are facing second-language problems in their classes.

3) What's the best way to test and teach the student who falls between ESL and Subject A? Should he be mainstreamed? (Consult the relevant literature.) Could the Freshman Preparatory Program (FP^2) become the place for him?

4) Consider the student at the lower end—e.g., the student with profound second-language interference, second-dialect interference, limited writing and reading experience. What treatments are possible? What campus resources, if any, are available?

STUDENT INFORMATION

1) How can student information best be used for teaching, for research, for program evaluation?

2) In addition to the data we're currently collecting, what other information would be helpful?

3) Would there be research value in surveying writing habits and attitudes after as well as before a course? Would this questionnaire be too much of a burden for students and teachers?

CURRICULUM AND TEXTS

1) Establish general guidelines to insure some curriculum/text uniformity and yet to insure some degree of instructor autonomy. Review curricula and syllabi from other schools, e.g. USC.

2) Survey current text. Report on selected texts. The reports should highlight strengths and weaknesses, compare same, and speculate on how particular texts would mesh with the evolving curriculum.

3) Explore alternatives to texts: loose materials, groups, conferencing, media, etc. Are texts necessary? If so (and the answer coul' well be "yes"), why are they necessary? Survey selected schools and teachers.

4) In line with the above, what does Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI) have to offer? What do studies of CAI's effectiveness show? How feasible is widespread use of CAI in freshman courses?

5) Draw up a set of criteria for evaluating a textbook. What features should a useful text have?

EVALUATION AND GRADES

1) Very much needed is a specific, comprehensive description of course goals and standards. What is each course trying to teach and what criteria can be offered for judging student performance?

2) Can we assure ourselves, through the research, that group grading is all it's cracked up to be? If we can be assured, can we then figure out ways to make our own grading more reliable, more valid, less taxing?

3) Is holistic grading the best way to evaluate student prose, given the evolving curriculum? Explore other methods of evaluation—e.g., primary trait scoring.

4) How can the quarterly evaluation of student writing contribute to program evaluation?

5) If it were possible to conduct, what sort of large-scale evaluation of student writing across class level and discipline would most help us form and modify our own program?

SPECIAL SECTIONS

Lower Division

1) Collect and analyze syllabi from current special sections.

2) How much diversity provides choice and richness, and how much leads to incoherence and diffuseness? Should we offer special sections? If so, how many? Should all sections be "special" in some way (e.g. library sections, honors, humanities, social sciencers, etc.)?

3) How should teachers be chosen for special sections?

4) Suggest particular goals for each type of special section and suggest ways the goals of the discipline can be integrated with the goals of composition.

5) Current special sections often use popular, well-written reflections on issues of life science, social science, etc. Lives of a Cell, Dispatches, Walden Two come to mind. Is this the best way to go? Rather than reading Lives of a Cell, should life science students be learning how to write lab reports with the assistance of Maimon et al's Writing in the Arts and Sciences? Is such specialized writing instruction asking too much of the teacher? Is special training an absolute necessity for those about to teach special sections?

6) How could we establish resources (both people and materials) for those teaching special sections?

SPECIAL SECTIONS
Upper Division

1) What upper division writing courses should we require or recommend? What would these courses teach? Consider the options we're now developing—English 100W, 131 (special sections), 136ABC.

2) Is an upper division course for transfer students feasible? Exactly what are the political/bureaucratic snags here?

3) Given the results of the English 3 survey (an overwhelming "yes" for advanced writing courses), should we plan upper division writing courses in technical writing, self-expressive, exploratory writing? (Note that English offers creative writing.)

4) Should some upper division courses be team taught, e.g., by Writing Programs and History or Chemistry?

5) Survey selected other institutions. See what their upper division programs look like. Propose an ideal upper division program.

CONFERENCING

1) Prepare a brief rationale, suggesting ways to set up conferencing, problems to be aware of, etc.

2) Compile a brief series of key articles—e.g. Garrison's.

3) Prepare a videotape of a model conference.

4) Survey selected composition programs that rely heavily on conferencing. What benefits, what problems have they found?

5) Conduct training workshops.

EDITING GUIDES

1) Collect editing guides from selected institutions.

2) Prepare brief rationale. Collect several good articles on the use of editing guides. Present a discussion of problems associated with their use.

3) Conduct workshops on the effective use of editing guides.

4) How would we best a) arrive at sufficient agreement among instructors about issues of usage and style and b) test the evolving guides (e.g., in classrooms, with tutors)?

5) Is it possible to produce a student guide to the various formal and stylistic conventions of different disciplines? If a comprehensive guide is impossible, how about a brief guide that at least alerts, with illustration, the student to the fact that differences exist?

6) This is Pat Taylor's and defies paraphrase and conflation:

Editing guides: (1) Develop a set of handouts that will guide peer groups in particular facets of writing—one on coherence that includes not just transition words, but the more sophisticated examples of integrating ideas (by noun-summations or rephrasing, for example). (2) Avoid the kind of guide that says "is the essay titled; is the diction varied." These are on all school continua and drive teachers crazy. What would really be helpful is a series of sheets teachers can actually distribute to groups, readable by kids, and forming the heart of what UCLA considers respect for the conventions of writing as well as awareness of its "soul."

RESEARCH

1) What could teachers do now that would build up a research data base for writing programs? e.g., gather student data, xerox representative papers.

2) Begin summarizing, in one or two pages, the best research on particular techniques, approaches, problems. These sheets could be distributed to TAs and Lecturers interested, in, say, revision or sentence combining or the marking of papers.

3) Be available to consult with other committees.

Appendix 3. Sub-Committee Reports

While in-house research and preparatory programs provide a wealth of information appropriate for program review, the most immediate and focused source of information comes from the Writing Programs sub-committees. These sub-committees have completed their investigations and have submitted their reports. We will summarize and comment on their conclusions. Full reports are on file in the Writing Programs office.

Teacher Training: This committee recommends a number of short-term training activities, including the following: the Writing Programs' summer orientation should include concurrent sessions on administrative and pedagogic issues; the year should begin with a formal lecture by a major composition specialist; staff seminars should be reconsidered based on a survey of lecturers' needs. Long-term, the committee recommends that Writing Programs initiate ongoing group norming/grading sessions accompanied by discussions of evaluation. The committee also stresses the need for workshops to explore the differences in stylistic and formal conventions across disciplines. Finally, the committee supports a certification program for Writing Programs lecturers.

Testing: The Subject A examination has traditionally relied on topics different from those students encounter elsewhere in the university. They have asked students to reflect on personal experience or to express opinions on general social issues. The chair of this committee, George Gadda, began experimenting with alternative versions of the exam through UCLA's Orientation Program in 1981. He gave one personal experience topic but added another requiring students to work from an attached prose passage and to demonstrate skills in analysis or argument. This modified exam was adopted as the Subject A Placement Test in May 1982.

Tutorial: It's not only ESL students who challenge the composition teacher's training; the university also admits a small number of students with profound written language difficulties. A standard composition course—even at the English A level—might not best serve these students because their needs are highly individual. The Tutorial Committee and several other committees recommend the establishment of an individualized study tutorial through the Academic Advancement Program (AAP), the Academic Resources Center (ARC), or the Fernald School. This tutorial would not receive credit but would displace units on a student's study list. The tutorial would enable students to receive intensive instruction to remedy very special problems.

ESL: Though many second language students are appropriately channeled into the ESL track, approximately two students in every English class still display second language interference in their writing. These are students who either have not been identified as second language speakers or have passed the ESL placement examination. The sub-committee recommends that composition teachers be provided training in second language instruction and that connections with campus tutorial services (AAP and ARC) be maintained, even strengthened.

Student Information: Teachers know pitifully little about the students who fill their classes. As the quarter progresses, some students reveal themselves, others don't. This sub-committee has already developed an excellent "personal data form" which students fill out on the first day of class. The form includes questions about languages spoken at home, previous writing experience, and reading habits. These forms provide the teacher with a quick overview of students' linguistic and educational backgrounds.

Curriculum and Textbooks: The committee highly recommends a two-quarter composition requirement. The first course would focus on the composing process and

experimentation with language, attempting to free students of narrow conceptualizations of composing and providing them with "new paradigm" discovery and investigation techniques. It would also allow them to develop facility with varieties of discourse, personae, and register. The second course—more like standard composition—would focus on university discourse and the development of critical editing skills. The first course would emphasize process, the second product.

Because we are not now proposing a two-quarter requirement, we cannot completely separate the teaching of process from the teaching of product in our freshman classes. We can, however, emphasize process in English 1 and 2 and product in English 3, and the committee's suggestions have influenced the principles, curricula, and goals outlined in this report.

Evaluation and Grades: This subcommittee commented on a number of issues, the most salient being the disjunction that has existed between English A and 1 and English 3 and the need for establishing clear criteria and consistency in grading. The committee recommends that error correction might best be tempered or at least be placed in proper perspective as an editing concern and that errors be explained in some hierarchical fashion—that is, that not all errors are equally damaging to reader understanding.

Special Sections—Lower Division: For some time, the English Department has offered special sections of English 3. These sections represent attempts to gear standard composition toward specific majors: life science, social science, fine arts, etc. In theory, these sections seem to fulfill one of the needs expressed earlier in this report: the necessity of teaching academic discourse. The problem, though, is that these courses could rarely be staffed properly. Furthermore, students would enroll in them because the course fit their schedule rather than because they fit their majors. The Special Sections Committee recommends abolishing these courses and instituting, instead, a post-English 3 course: "English S." English S would be optional and would offer further training in composition, but within the general framework of a discipline. In addition to old special section analogues like "writing in the fine arts," there would also be sections labelled "research and library skills" and "business writing." These sections would be staffed by specially trained teachers, and enrollment would be limited.

Special Sections—Upper Division: This committee arrived at its recommendations through surveys of students, teachers, and administrators. One of the committee's first recommendations—one similar to that of the Lower-Division group—was that Writing Programs create an intermediate-level, post-3/pre-131, course. They also recommend more sections (particularly special sections) of 131 and additional sections of 136. Conversely, they suggest that Writing Programs stabilize the number and base-course connections of 100Ws. This pattern would ease the administration of these courses and bolster enrollment. Long-term recommendations include the creation of a required junior-year discipline-specific writing course and a series of alternatives to strict academic exposition: e.g., courses in autobiographical writing and the belletristic essay.

Editing Guides and Conferencing: If we expect teachers, particularly new ones, to adopt "new paradigm" approaches, then we'll have to provide appropriate training and necessary materials. Two very popular current pedagogic techniques are peer editing and conferencing.

During peer editing, students, in groups of three to five, help each other revise papers. They read each others' work, comment on how well their partner is communicating, on tone and organization, and on issues of correctness. To carry out such peer revising effectively, students need guidance. Some guidance comes from the

teacher who displays appropriate ways to provide evaluation. Other guidance is provided by editing guides—sheets that list the discourse features students should be examining. The Editing Guides Committee both collected and created such guides. The committee will also set up a teacher training seminar and create several videotapes illustrating proper peer editing techniques.

Conferencing is essentially teacher and student talking—but with several key distinctions. Teacher and student don't talk, as they often do, once the paper is finished and graded but, rather, while the paper is in progress. And the talk is open—the teacher encouraging the student to express his or her intention so that the teacher can better assist and instruct. The Conferencing Committee is developing guidelines for such encounters and is planning a training seminar.

Research: To keep lecturers abreast of important developments in composition theory and research and to encourage those lecturers who wish to engage in research, Writing Programs should do the following: provide voluntary workshops in theory and methodology, establish a forum through which lecturers could share their research with their colleagues, begin building a library and a computer-stored annotated bibliography, and start a bi-annual newsletter that would summarize the best of current research.

Appendix 4. Instructor's Guide

The Proposed Freshman Writing Program

During 1982-83, we will be testing and developing the proposed freshman writing program. To help instructors plan for the year, we include here a statement of philosophy, five sample syllabi, and several research projects. (See also Appendix 6.)

This committee, report, and review have aimed at multiplicity, comprehensiveness. We have drawn our faculty into the process because we can learn from them and because they give the program life. Articulating a "comprehensive" statement of philosophy could imply that everyone teaching for us must subscribe to this statement. Rather, we would prefer that our program's philosophy emerge gradually from this report, our teaching and research, and our staff seminars. Such a philosophy would be truly comprehensive. Thus, the following statement is tentative, and we offer it primarily to open discussion of basic issues.

Similarly, the syllabi presented here are suggestions, demonstrating how the principles and goals outlined in the report might be embodied in several different course outlines. These, too, should stimulate ideas and discussion. An instructor may choose to develop fully one of these syllabi, modify one or combine several, or, in fact, substitute another carefully designed individual syllabus. Again, we want to encourage variety and at the same time to develop consistency from class to class.

The proposed research projects also show alternative ways of reaching the same goal. Students should have some introduction to academic research, and instructors may choose the form and scope of that instruction.

In sum, our faculty will create individually coherent classes, blending philosophy, course outlines, and particular assignments into unified instruction. And from these individual units will emerge a unified freshman program, the basis for a coherent and comprehensive series of writing programs.

Philosophy
Patricia Taylor

Writing at a research university is essential because of the powerful correspondences between the attributes of the writing and research. Both operate on ideas in the same way: discover, examine, revise, and disseminate. "It is doubtful whether a man ever brings his faculties to bear with full force on a subject until he writes upon it." (Cicero) The need to discover ideas, one's own and others', initiates writing as it does research; and various heuristics help the scholar/writer determine the extent and limits of his knowledge. Summarizing others' thoughts, gathering in one place ideas from multiple sources, combining thoughts in new ways--these dynamic processes are inconceivable without writing.

Next, writing allows the scholar to look as in a mirror into the workings of his mind. By casting ideas concretely on the page, the writer can stand back and objectively analyze them, play judge and jury of his theory's worth. With this cross-examination of the self in words comes an invitation to revise. Without the storage and retrieval of information and insight made possible by the written word, certain kinds of thinking simply would be impossible. (Process researchers who have people write with invisible ink find that their subjects are unable to continue thoughts they can't re-view.)

As the writer-researcher is forced to transform the multi-dimensional chaos of his impressions and formulations into the linear sequences of writing, he learns discernment and logic. He sees the need to clarify relationships between ideas. Then, as he begins to envision the probable audience for his work—often a skeptical audience—he questions his assumptions. Trying to enter the mind and values of his reader, he broadens his own perspectives and shifts his own attitudes. Although writing can be many things—a means of self-discovery, a testing device, even a therapeutic calmative—at the university it is primarily a tool for cognitive growth, a vehicle for the advancement of ideas.

Yet many students do little original research at the university. Content with a bachelor's degree, and facing careers in engineering, mathematics, or business, they see writing largely as practical training for the job. And since over 55 percent of jobs in our society now are in information services, it is much more likely that our graduates will work on daily memos, reports, and computer documentation than on machines to be operated. Even as doctors or lawyers, they must be masters of the language whose careful use is so essential to their clients' trust. So a secondary function of teaching writing at a university is to examine the rhetoric of the various disciplines. Eventually the linguistic and rhetorical training we provide filters from the marketplace into the political arena, raising or lowering the tone of government and social discourse. Even basic composition should promote the examination of various issues through a spectrum of styles and conventions: business, scientific, legal, and political. Writing is the bridge that links all subjects, all discourse.

Yet neither the marketplace nor university research should circumscribe the writing our students do. Writing also serves a very human need, for self-affirmation. As social beings, we do not merely write; we also expect response. The writer always hopes the reader not only understands the message but also sees the person behind the prose. This self wants praise not only for a clear message but also for some measure of personality, grace, and even wit. Two implications for composition teaching arise here. One is the need to teach sympathetic response to writing, to insure that communication goes both ways, and to develop in students a sense of audience as well as of persona. The other implication is that we attend to the writer as stylist, that we expose student writers to those resources of language responsible for the pure pleasure of words. Writing should not sound as if it is mass-produced: the shape of writing, its sparkle and verve, its harmonies, tell readers they are valuable as persons. Stylistic concerns become not just pleasing but useful as the writer reaches out to a wider audience, affecting readers not as patient as his teachers.

Style produces writing as an artifact, a tangible object that possesses life of its own once it is born on the printed page. "A word is dead when it is said, some say; I say it just begins to live that day." (Emily Dickinson) At the point of dissemination, shape, format, respect for all the conventions become critical. Originality, style, and voice in speaking cannot be simply transcribed into writing. In order to internalize precisely how language works, what is effective in sound and sense, the apprentice writer needs to read widely—and even to read aloud. Thus close reading must be built into a writing program.

Working with this philosophy as a base, writing instructors at UCLA will present composition as a discovery process, as a way of learning about other university disciplines, about the outside world, about language, and about the self. We will train students to be better thinkers, readers, and critics as well as better writers. But we will enact this general philosophy in our different ways, in our different classrooms.

Sample Syllabi

Mike Rose

Preface

Our intention here is to make more concise the representative course descriptions on pp. 11-17. To do so, we detail sections of sample syllabi that build from those course descriptions. We do not intend these syllabi to be read as the one right way to satisfy this proposal's curricular guidelines and course descriptions, but, rather, as models, as suggestions for teachers to adapt and modify.

Following are some guidelines that apply to all five syllabi; we will mention them here rather than repeat them in each syllabus.

- All courses rely, in their way, on current process models of composing. That is, students should engage in a good deal of writing that is not intended for formal evaluation. Teachers can have students write brief entries in journals, sketch out notes and rough drafts, plan in various ways. Students should be allowed to work out ideas without concern for "correctness." Teachers should also encourage and allow room for revision, for reworking at least selected, early drafts. Guidance with planning and revising strategies is integral to such an approach.

- Several of the sample syllabi include stylistics exercises, but appropriate work on style should be incorporated into all 1, 2, and 3 courses. This work can include sentence-combining, imitation exercises, and rhetorical analyses. In all cases, students should be required to take an active part in this work, pen in hand. Listening to lectures on style, at this level, isn't effective.

- Though some syllabi contain a fair amount of reading, no syllabus represents an "introduction to . . . " course, a lecture course. The focus of all courses is on student discussion and the extension of that discussion to writing. Teachers are free to use peer groups or keep their classes intact, set up workshops or maintain more formal classrooms. Certainly, teachers will need to establish frameworks and guidelines, introduce concepts and materials, fill in conceptual gaps, but the students should be encouraged to wrestle with ideas, arrive at interpretations, and make connections—both orally and in writing.

- We are very concerned about evaluation, both as a thorny conceptual problem and as a bald necessity. And while we will be encouraging discussion throughout the year on issues ranging from the validity of specific evaluation schemes to grade inflation, we do not hold to one evaluative method. Teachers can rely on relatively traditional means of evaluating papers or on current alternative approaches such as those provided by conferencing techniques.

- A word on our expectations about numbers of assignments. We are wary of flatly stating that a particular course requires x number of papers, for such specifications can undercut our desire that students write a great deal, as much as they need to, and that they not be concerned with submitting all of that writing for formal evaluation. On the other hand, teachers need to have some guidelines for assigning papers. We offer the following:

  English 1 and 2. Students should do a good deal of in-class writing—journals, freewriting, rehearsals for assignments. There should be one

formal, though short, paper per week (approximately 1-2 pages for English 1, 1-3 pages for English 2). Some of these should be written out of class. The teacher can choose to combine several short papers into one longer paper and can determine the ratio of in- to out-of-class assignments.

English 3. Students should do a good deal of in-class prewriting and rehearsing. They will be required to submit 5 out-of-class papers, 3-5 pages in length.

A COURSE IN AUTOBIOGRAPHY—FROM PERSONAL TO ACADEMIC WRITING

David Bartholomae and Anthony Petrosky, the University of Pittsburgh professors who created this course, sent Freshman Writing a complete collection of course materials as well as a long article describing the course and placing it in a theoretical context. Both the materials and the article are on file in the Freshman Writing office. To give the reader a sense of the course and to attempt to scale it down from a semester to a quarter, we will offer a brief outline.

There are five kinds of assignments in the course: 1) readings from assigned books, 2) formal writing on those readings (the writing moves from simple retelling of narrative events through summary to classifying, analyzing, and theorizing), 3) informal writing on the readings (this expressive writing can be kept in student journals), 4) student autobiographies, 5) formal writing on these autobiographies. Bartholomae and Petrosky suggest suspending most concerns about correctness until the mid-point in the course. Because of UCLA's ten-week limit, teachers will most likely have to dispense with some of the elements of the original course—weekly in-class reading, for example.

Week 1: Students are given an early chapter from Margaret Mead's autobiography, Blackberry Winter, one that describes her undergraduate experiences at DePauw. (This is also on file in the Freshman Writing office.) Students read it, list its key events and react, in writing, to Mead's experiences. Students are then asked to write about a change in themselves during their own collegiate (or immediately pre-collegiate) lives. Students begin reading Maya Angelou's I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings.

Week 2: Students summarize, in writing, selected chapters of I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings. They then write about a period in their lives when they decided it was time for a change and were able to effect one. They compare this experience to a period when they realized it was time for a change but couldn't or didn't change. They continue reading I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings and begin discussion of the purpose, shape, and effect of autobiography.

Week 3: The class (or peer groups) list the different changes they can find in Mead, Angelou, and their own reports. They then attempt to classify and label the various kinds of changes they can identify. They write a paper that presents a classification system for changes in adolescence. They begin reading Gail Sheehy's Passages, discussing, among other things, the format of the book. The teacher offers reading strategies.

Week 4: Students, as a whole class or in groups, discuss the first part or two of Passages. Discussion includes applicability of the book's propositions to the students' experiences, the legitimacy of generalizing from case studies, the face value or common

sense of a developmental theory like that presented in Passages. Some of these discussions will become the stuff of in-class and/or take-home written assignments. At around this point, the teacher should begin expressing concern about "correctness" and editing. If small groups are used, the teacher should spend some time showing students how to act as peer editors. The autobiography assignment is explained.

Week 5: This week is pretty much devoted to writing and revising student autobiographies. Assignments 12-15 in Bartholomae and Petrosky's course materials offer one plan for completing the autobiographies. Individual teachers might want to include more steps than they suggest or allow more time than they allot.

Week 6: Students continue work on autobiographies. The teacher should once again raise questions about the purpose, shape, and effect of autobiography. Now would be a good time to once again ask students to consider the relevance of Passages to their lives, as they have formalized their lives in print. The final, typewritten drafts of the autobiographies are turned in at the end of the week and sent to a duplication service. Students are to buy them by the following class meeting. They also begin reading Edgar Friedenberg's The Vanishing Adolescent. (Start with Chapter 5.)

Week 7: Students discuss the case studies of five high schoolers presented in Friedenberg's fifth chapter and write an in-class essay in which they summarize each student's case and attempt to apply Sheehy's catagories to them. Students read other selected chapters in The Vanishing Adolescent. Students begin analyzing their collected autobiographies. Assignment 18 in Bartholomae and Petrosky's course materials offers a good set of guidelines. In essence, the categorizing, analytic eye students turned to their individual and to Mead's and Angelou's autobiographies during Week 3 will now be turned to the class's collected work.

Week 8: Now students attempt to look at their collected autobiographical "case studies" as though they were Edgar Friedenberg. Using his framework, students write a paper analyzing the accounts of their lives. Students discuss similarities and differences between Friedenberg and Sheehy. Students begin reading Mead's Coming of Age in Samoa and write a brief account of how her methodology is similar to or different from that of Sheehy and of Friedenberg.

Week 9: Students continue reading Mead. Friedenberg found conflict to be part of adolescence; students discuss, then write on, the conflict or lack of it that Mead found among Samoan adolescents. (See Bartholomae and Petrosky's Assignment 22 for some guidelines.)

Week 10: This final week is spent discussing Coming of Age in Samoa, the role of culture in influencing growth and change, and the students' collected autobiographies from a cultural perspective. Students rely on the class's autobiographies and write an essay in which they discuss the way culture determines how one becomes a "full-fledged adult member of his or her society."

THE PROJECT WORKSHOP

The class spends a good deal of time in peer groups of three to five students, though it remains intact as a "seminar" when the teacher is presenting information and when students are delivering interim or final reports on their research. Since the class is taught as a workshop/seminar, a day-by-day syllabus seems unnecessary. What follows is a suggested sequence of activities for two of the class's three or four projects. The

teacher can gauge, depending on student progress, how much time to devote to each activity.

Project #1
Library Research

Step 1: The teacher can provide a list of topics or turn the task of producing suggestions over to the class or the small groups. The topics should be relatively controversial and relatively popular (and thus accessible) and circumscribed enough to be dealt with in a 2-3 week period.

Step 2: Again, for selecting and narrowing topics, there are several ways to go. The teacher can have already-created groups decide on their own topics or create groups around shared interest in particular topics. Once groups are formed, the teacher should help each narrow its topic appropriately.

> (A word of warning on steps 1 and 2. The teacher should place time limits on these group or whole class activities to keep students from endlessly generating ideas or waffling on topic decisions.)

Step 3: Now that groups are formed and issues are chosen, each student is obliged to spend time searching out three to four different sources that address his or her group's issue. The teacher should provide (or have the University Library Service provide) instruction on the use of library resources and reference materials. The teacher should also provide brief instructions on research tricks—e.g., using the reference list of a recent article as a guide to earlier articles or being sure to keep notes on all relevant bibliographic information.

Step 4: During the week or so while students are learning about the library and running down sources, the teacher is showing the students samples of annotated bibliographies and teaching them how to write the kind of summary that would suit such a bibliography.

The teacher discusses with the class the purpose (and thus the nature) of these annotated bibliographies/summaries. Students will eventually be sharing their bibliographies with others in the group, so the summaries must be clear and relevant. (Students should know, then, that if they can't understand a particular source well enough to summarize it, it probably should be eliminated.)

One simple way to teach summary is to present students with successively more difficult (and successively longer) excerpts and full articles. The teacher helps them find the gist, main points, supporting data. These exercises can also be done in groups. At first, students can bring in material of their own choosing, but the teacher soon shifts the materials toward the academic. Students paraphrase orally, then in writing, then shift to more formal written summary. The Freshman Preparatory Program's sourcebook has some materials that could be used for work on summary, and Charles Bazerman's The Informed Writer (Houghton Mifflin, 1981) has a remarkably full treatment of paraphrasing and summarizing.

If the students summarize inadequately (and this can be determined with a first-week diagnostic test), then there are two ways to go: the teacher begins working on summary before students actually have to summarize on their own, or, if the class will do more than one library research unit, the teacher can work with the students as they first attempt summarizing. Their unit projects will be slowed up, but, for some, the

meaningful context of the project will make the work on summary less tedious.

Step 5: On the assigned day, students bring enough typed xeroxed copies of their summaries for their group. The group reads all summaries. Group members discuss the summaries and decide on the major issues of the controversy. (Since, in many cases, students chose their controversial topics before they had a rich knowledge of them, this is their chance to become well-informed. Each group has developed its own bibliography.)

Step 6: Again, there are several options. One would require each student to write a full paper on a particular aspect of his or her group's controversy. Another would have each group member write a section of a paper: member #1 writes the introduction, member #2 summarizes one issue surveyed in the introduction, member #3 summarizes another issue. In either case, several drafts should be written, and the teacher should assist individuals or the group with the first. A group paper, particularly, requires the teacher's editorial assistance.

Project #2
Investigative Reporting

Step 1: The teacher discusses investigative reporting and distributes several examples. (A recommendation: At least one example should come from one of the good magazines aimed at young people. Rolling Stone and Mother Jones, for example, regularly print reputable pieces of investigative journalism.)

Step 2: To select topics, students, either as an entire class or in small groups, generate a list of issues they'd like to investigate. Each student decides on at least two topics, for one choice might not be appropriate—the student might not have access to resources, for example, or the topics might already have been comprehensively covered.

Step 3: The teacher discusses sources of information and appropriate methods for gaining it: examination of public documents, interviews, investigator's observation. Pros and cons of various sources and methods are considered. The teacher might want to distribute or at least discuss excerpts from the methods sections of a social science or journalism textbook. (One excellent source, on file in the Freshman Writing office, is John Lofland's Analyzing Social Settings [Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1971]. See, especially, Chapters 4 and 5.)

Step 4: Students begin investigating. During the week or two while collecting information, students can be reading further pieces of investigative journalism, and summarizing, comparing and contrasting, or analyzing them. They should also be giving interim reports, oral or written. One important writing assignment here would be a paper on methods of gaining information—a discussion of particular techniques and their advantages and limitations. This is also the time to discuss quotation of primary sources, particularly the issue of when one should paraphrase vs. when one should rely on the impact of a source's original language.

Step 5: Students share the first draft of their papers with the group. Issues of concern should include the relative value of information, the effectiveness of presentation, and the need for further research. The teacher can respond to this draft or require that a second draft be produced based on the group's response. He or she could then respond to this second draft.

Step 6 (Optional): If the teacher does not want to end this project with the

investigative report, he or she can require a further paper, one that would help students differentiate reporting from academic analysis and would allow them fuller use of their data. For this optional paper, students choose from their other courses or the teacher helps them find a theory, an explanatory framework, with which to analyze their data. For example, role theory would lend itself to analysis of certain social or work situations or the political economy paradigm could prove useful in discussing disenfranchised groups.

CROSS-DISCIPLINARY THEME-CENTERED COURSE

The theme of this particular syllabus is "Insiders and Outsiders." The first third of a syllabus is presented. Teachers would continue in the vein of these three weeks, relying on other systems, other categories of "insiders and outsiders."

First meeting: Introduction to the Theme of "Insiders and Outsiders." Discussion of exclusion from human communities: membership, deviance, isolation. Consideration of human communities as systems. Trans-human systems: organizations and institutions. Non-human systems: biological and ecological systems. Class discussion of what "inclusion" and "exclusion" mean. Is anyone or any object ever truly excluded? Included? (A poem or short story, or a brief excerpt from a sociology text might help make this discussion more concrete.)

Second meeting: Labelling and Isolation. Readings: Richard Wright, "The Man Who Went to Chicago" (in Eight Men [New York: Pyramid, 1976]) and D. L. Rosenhan, "On Being Sane in Insane Places" (Science, v. 179, 19 January 1973, pp. 1-9). Discussion of labelling and isolation in both pieces. Implications of both. Students move from discussion to drafting a brief essay that summarizes the events and results of each piece. This essay will be handed in at the third meeting.

Third meeting: Community. Readings: John Sayles, "At the Anarchists' Convention" (in The Anarchists' Convention and Other Stories [New York: Pocket Books, 1980]) and Albert Camus, "The Growing Stone" (in Exile and the Kingdom [New York: Knopf, 1958]). Discussion of community: definition and formation. During the last 10-15 minutes of class, students write out their definitions. "Correctness" can be ignored. The teacher collects these statements but does not grade them.

Fourth meeting: Loneliness within Community. Readings: Robert S. Weiss, "An Uprooted Woman: Mrs. Phillips" (in Loneliness: The Experience of Emotional and Social Isolation [Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1973], pp. 165-174) and Albert Camus, "The Adulterous Woman" (in Exile and the Kingdom [New York: Knopf, 1958]). (A brief excerpt from David Riesman's The Lonely Crowd could also work well here.) Discussion of isolation in social surroundings. Students move from discussion to the drafting of a brief essay that attempts an extended definition of isolation. This essay will be handed in at the fifth meeting.

Fifth meeting: Madness and Others: Community as Cause and Cure of Madness. Readings: Joseph W. Eaton and Robert J. Weil, "The Mental Health of the Hutterites" (Scientific American, v. 189, 1953, pp. 31-37) and R.D. Laing and Aaron Esterson, "The Abbotts," (in Sanity, Madness and the Family [Hardmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1972], pp. 31-50). (An optional, though very appropriate, article is the sociologist Edwin Lemert's "Paranoia and the Dynamics of Exclusion," Sociometry, v. 25, 1962, pp. 2-20.) Discussion of the maddening and healing potentials of social groups. Teacher hands back

students' definitions of community written during the third meeting. Students modify their definitions in accordance with their discussion.

Sixth meeting: Full length paper due. Students are to use all the readings to date to define issues of inclusion and exclusion, isolation and community. The teacher frames the topics to best suit or best play off of the last two weeks' discussions. One assignment could simply require students to define "loneliness." Another could ask them to define "the social dimension of mental health."

Seventh meeting: A new unit is introduced. Ecological/Biological Systems. Readings: Excerpt from Barry Commoner, "The Ecosystem," pp. 28-44 of chapter 1 of The Closing Circle (New York: Bantam, 1972) and John L. Culliney, "The Kelp Forests" (in The Forests of the Sea [New York: Anchor, 1979], pp. 245-255). Discussion of ecological systems and the interdependence of organisms. Students, orally and in writing, apply Commoner's framework to the kelp forests. This essay will be handed in at the eighth meeting.

Eighth meeting: External Threats to Systems. Readings: Paul R. Ehrlich and Anne H. Ehrlich, "Modifying Ecosystems" (in Population Resource Environment—Issues in Human Ecology [San Francisco: Freeman, 1970], pp. 165-181). Students discuss the "insiders" and "outsiders" here. What effect does the "outsider" have? Is the "outsider" here as powerless as many of the outsiders presented in the previous unit? Brief in-class writing.

Ninth meeting: Inside and Outside: Observing Natural Phenomena. Readings: Excerpt from Karl von Frisch, "The Language of Bees" (in The Dancing Bees [New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1966], pp. 113-117); Konrad Lorenz, "Robbery in the Aquarium" (in King Solomon's Ring [New York: Signet, 1972], pp. 36-40); the "ant war" excerpt from Henry David Thoreau, Walden (New York: Dolphin, 1960) pp. 194-197); Richard Brautigan, "The Weather in San Francisco" (in The Revenge of the Lawn [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971], pp. 42-43); Annie Dillard, excerpt from "The Fixed" (in Pilgrim at Tinker Creek [New York: Bantam, 1974], pp. 65-70). Students discuss the different stances outsiders take in these passages and write a paper in which they define and classify these stances. (These materials also lend themselves to discussions of point of view, style, and rhetorical strategies.)

Tenth meeting: Discussion of stance continues. Then students return to a discussion of living systems, their interrelations, and their disconnections. Commoner's ecological model is reconsidered. Students write a paper using the readings from this unit to support, qualify, or refute Commoner's model.

The teacher would continue along these lines, either building on existing materials (other assignments could be drawn from the above readings) or adding new units and new materials. Some suggestions for further units: bureaucratic-industrial systems, religious institutional systems, the "systems" of popular culture—taste, fads, what's "in" and what's "out," intellectual systems (e.g., ways of classifying creative products). The last system—since it is abstract—could lead to rarified (and thus unsuccessful) lessons, with one exception. A one- to two-week unit using art slides to illustrate the concepts of periods, intellectual classifications, the politics and sociology of art could work well with the right teacher and the right class. All the reading materials referred to in the mock syllabus are on file in the Freshman Writing Office.

THE FRESHMAN PREPARATORY PROGRAM CURRICULUM

The Preparatory Program curriculum attempts to combine instruction in academic writing, reading, and stylistics with a process approach to composing. During the quarter, students work primarily with brief excerpts from a wide variety of academic disciplines. Depending on the particular exercise they're engaged in, students might read and discuss these excerpts, subject them to stylistic analysis, or use them as the basis for a writing assignment. Writing assignments are built on a sequence of expository strategies ranging from simple definition through analysis and academic argument. The curriculum is designed to introduce students to the conventions of academic discourse while providing them with an overview of the way knowledge is variously defined and presented in the university. Of the five curricula presented in this appendix, the Preparatory Program curriculum tends to incorporate work from the largest number of disciplines (though the representative work is often brief) and tends to rely on the most tightly sequenced series of assignments.

Following is a sample syllabus for English 2. On file in the Freshman Writing office are conceptually similar syllabi for English 1 and English 3. Also on file is a 200-page sourcebook of materials, some of which are referred to in the English 2 syllabus.

Syllabus for English 2

	M.	T.	W.	Th.
1.	Introduction P/D/W (present/ discuss/ write) or R/D/W (read/ discuss/ write)* exercise.	Rhetoric and vocabulary lessons are extracted chapter by chapter from an assigned novel or non-fiction work.** Paragraph development, g/sc (grammar/ sentence-combining).	The process of defining with illustration is reviewed. F/D/W (film/ discuss/write) or R/D/W.*	Book—** rhetoric and vocabulary development, grammar/ sentence combining.
2.	Mock essay exam: Definition. Discussion of exam strategies.	Book—rhetoric and vocabulary dev., g/sc.	Discuss Monday's definition exam. Introduce imitation exercise.	Book— rhetoric and vocabulary. Beyond the paragraph, g/sc.

* P/D/W, R/D/W, and F/D/W are all exercises to get students as a class or in groups to think through what they've read or heard or seen and written. R/D/W materials are 2-3 page excerpts. P/D/W simply involves the teacher presenting brief compilations of straight facts, empirical conclusions, or opinions on an issue. In F/D/W, a short film provides the stimulus for discussion and composing. Students discuss then write, and might then be told to discuss further, then write further.

** Students will read one or two books closely discussing them chapter-by-chapter twice a week. Everything from plot to style to vocabulary will be studied; all will be tested. Books can be fiction or non-fiction, Crime and Punishment to Even Cowgirls Get the Blues, Dewey to Illich.

3.	Seriation introduced. Viral reduplication exercise—groups. Imitation exercise—describe registering at UCLA in style of catalogue or Time, Heavy Metal, Richard Pryor, for example.	Book—rhetoric and vocabulary. Beyond the paragraph, g/sc.	Discuss Monday's seriation paper. New exercise: seriation compared with description and definition.	Group. Interview: Visitor describes complex process containing cause-effect.
4.	Class into groups—compare notes, write group seriation papers on interview. Interviewer returns, hears papers, offers suggestions. Gives new information—"Revision Scramble."*	Monday's papers turned in. Book—rhetoric and vocabulary. Beyond the paragraph, g/sv.	Students bring in examples of Seriation assignments and directions. Seriation compared to narrative in book, to causal chains in biological processes, etc. Imitation exercise—rewrite breadth text seriation passage.	Seriation—mock essay exam (possibly on material in book). Summary introduced.
5.	Field Trip e.g., emergency room, astronomy presentation. Students take notes.	Discuss trip. Discuss summary—what to include, omit.	Summary from field trip xeroxed and discussed. Film (F/D/W): "3 Therapies" or "3 Psychoses." Write summary.	Wednesday's paper continued, revised.

* Revision Scramble

After students have written one draft, the teacher presents new data or new opinion. Students must rewrite to account for new information.

6.	Imitation exercise—rewrite therapies or psychoses summary in style of Rolling Stone, Saturday Night Live, etc.	Book—rhetoric and vocabulary. The essay, g/sv.	Summary—mock essay exam (possibly on material from book). Discussions, examples of summary from texts and articles.	Classification introduced. Field trip to archaeology, geology, or botany exhibit.
7.	Groups use field notes to create classifications—present to entire group. In-class writing.	Book—rhetoric and vocabulary. The essay, g/sv	Classification—20 slides of human form. Class creates categories. In-class writing.	Human form paper xeroxed and discussed. "Revision Scramble." Final paper introduced—definition and classification of book's rhetorical devices.
8.	Classification discussed. Examples of classification in breadth texts are brought in. Combined modes in essays is discussed.	Book—rhetoric and vocabulary. The essay, g/sv	Classification—quotations on genius or definitions of "light." Imitation exercise on genius or light.	Classification exercise—20 1st paragraphs from novels and articles.
9.	20 paragraphs paper xeroxed and discussed. Simple compare/contrast and its role in classification introduced.	Classification—mock essay exam (possibly on material from book).	Compare/contrast: select from quotations on genius or 20 paragraphs.	Workshop on final paper—definition and classification of book's rhetorical terms.

10. The epistomology of comparison—students bring in one photo, song, drawing they think is "good" and one "bad"—pinpoint quality by comparing.	Work on final paper.	In-class paper—Monday's discussion.	Submit Final paper.

CROSS-CULTURAL READINGS CURRICULUM

Though this curriculum incorporates literature, it is not a literature course. That is, it should not become the kind of survey offered in UCLA's introductory literature and humanities courses. Certainly, there will be times when "literary" topics relating to character, point of view, and style should be discussed. But the intention of the course is to use literature as a basis for anthropological, sociological, political, or historical writing assignments. What follows is the first few weeks of two sequences of assignments.

Week 1: Readings: Excerpts from Max Luthi's Once Upon a Time: On the Nature of Fairy Tales (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1976); Bruno Bettelheim, "Fairy Tales and the Existential Predicament" (in The Uses of Enchantment: The Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales [New York, Knopf, 1977], pp. 6-11). Students discuss and compare these two analyses of fairy tales. Then students either recall or read for the first time a fairy tale of their own choosing and discuss the match between the tale and Luthi's and/or Bettelheim's analysis. In- and out-of-class writing. Many of the well-known analyses of fairy tales (e.g., Luthi's, Vladimir Propp's) concentrate on European narratives. Have students find a South or Central American tale through the library, a folklorist, a relative or friend and discuss points of convergence and divergence between it and Luthi's and Bettelheim's analyses. Some of this work might spill over into week 2.

Week 2: Readings: Gabriel Garcia Marquez, "The Handsomest Drowned Man in the World" and "A Very Old Man with Enormous Wings" (in Leaf Storm and Other Stories [New York: Avon, 1973]). Engage students in a brief discussion of the nature of the stories' characters and events. They then begin the following discussions and assignments: Latin American fiction like Marquez's has been referred to as "magical realism," and Marquez himself sub-titled each of his two stories, "A Tale for Children." What in these two stories is "magical" or "fairy tale-like"? What is realistic? Have students write in class. Are either of the stories more similar to the students' Latin American tales than to the ones from their own culture (if their own culture is not Latin American.) Again, in-class discussion and writing.

Week 3: Readings: Jorge Amado, The Two Deaths of Quincas Wateryell, (New York: Avon, 1980). Engage students in a brief discussion of the nature of the novella's characters and events. Are there similarities or differences between The Two Deaths of Quincas Wateryell and the fairy tales presented earlier? Between Amado's novella and Marquez's stories? The teacher writes up or discusses the nature of the tall tale (for Amado subtitled his work "A Tall Tale"). Students write a paper classifying and drawing conclusions about the exaggerated, even fantastic, characters and events in all the

preceeding fairy tales and short fiction.

The teacher could take a number of directions from here. One option: continue with various kinds of tales as well as literature that builds from or is infuenced by them, perhaps moving beyond Latin American boundaries to Asia or Africa. The focus could be on people, community, and culture. For example: What is the nature of the fairy or folk tale hero? What influence does he or she have on community? What cultural need does he or she seem to satisfy? Appropriate readings from folklore and anthropology would be included. Another option, not necessarily excluded from the first: have students track down oral and written versions of tales. (With Los Angeles' polyglot population, this should be easier than it seems.) Discussion would focus on the differences between oral and written language and could easily lead to work from linguistics, cognitive psychology, and the sociology and anthropology of literacy. (The following collections of folktales might prove useful: Stith Thompson, One Hundred Favorite Folktales (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1968); Americo Paredes, ed. Folktales of Mexico in the series Folktales of the World, Richard M. Dorson, ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970); Yolando Pino Saavedra, Folktales of Chile in the series Folktales of the World, Richard M. Dorson, ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970); Richard M. Dorson, ed. Folktales told Around the World (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.) A third option: The teacher could move beyond the fantasy of the folk or fairy tale, investigating the positive and negative effects of fantasy on individuals and communities—particularly in colonized or emerging countries. One suggestion. Students would read Manuel Puig's Betrayed by Rita Hayworth (New York: Avon, 1981) and consider its events in light of perspectives like the following:

> Nowadays when a person lives somewhere, in a neighborhood, the place is not certified for him. More than likely he will live there sadly and the emptiness which is inside him will expand until it evacuates the entire neighborhood. But if he sees a movie which shows his very neighborhood, it becomes possible for him to live, for a time at least, as a person who is Somewhere and not Anywhere.
>
> —Walker Percy, The Moviegoer
> (New York: Noonday, 1975, p. 63)

Students would then work with other perspectives, those focussing on the sociology and politics of such "certification."

But, in the same way that the teacher does not have to stay with the literature of one culture, he or she does not have to remain with one theme. So, for example, after doing three or four weeks on folk and fairy tales, the teacher could shift to more strictly political concerns. Certainly, Latin American and African literature lends itself to such analysis.

We will offer another third of a ten week syllabus below. It could be considered another unit in a syllabus like the one presented above or could also represent another approach to the Cross-Cultural Readings Curriculum, one centering around political, historical, sociological issues.

Week 1: Readings: Evelyn P. Stevens, "Mexican Machismo: Politics and Value Orientations" (Western Political Quarterly, v. 18, December 1965, pp. 848-857); Evelyn P. Stevens, "Marianismo: The Other Face of Machismo in Latin America" (in Ann Pescatello, ed., Female and Male in Latin America [Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973], pp. 89-101). Students compare "machismo" and "marianismo" as they're presented by Stevens. They then discuss the applicability of these two images to their

own cultures and subcultures, noting similarities and differences. Students can summarize Stevens' articles or compare them to analyses of students' own cultures and sub-cultures. (For an additional exercise, have students apply Stevens' discussion of marianismo to "Remedios the Beauty" in Chapter 12 of Gabriel Garcia Marquez's 100 Years of Solitude [New York: Avon, 1979])

Week 2: Readings: Carlos Fuentes, The Death of Artemio Cruz (New York: Farrar, Strauss, 1969). Students discuss the first third to half of the novel, concentrating on Fuentes' depiction of Artemio Cruz, his posture and his relationships, with the twin concepts of "machismo" and "marianismo."

Week 3: Readings: Continue reading Carlos Fuentes, The Death of Artemio Cruz. Read Octavio Paz, "Mexican Masks," (in The Labyrinth of Solitude [New York: Grove Press, 1961], pp. 29-46). (It would be best to slightly abridge the chapter, removing literary references that are probably unknown to most composition students.) In "Mexican Masks" Paz considers inauthenticity, posing, dissimulation. Students discuss Paz's chapter and then apply it to Artemio Cruz. Students reconsider Stevens' discussion in light of "Mexican Masks."

Proposal for Introducing Research/Library Skills into the English 3 Curriculum

Jennifer Wilson, Pat Chittenden, Janette Lewis, Susan Popkin

As a way of introducing some study of research and library skills into the English 3 curriculum, the Committee recommends the following:

1. Each English 3 section should include at least one assignment requiring students to find material in the library.
2. The amount of library sophistication required for the assignments will vary according to the instructor's wishes.
3. A librarian will address each section once, covering library resources the assignment requires. The lecture will range from the minimum—short film, brief commentary—to the maximum, with instruction on bibliographies, bibliographic guides, newspaper indices, government documents, etc.
4. The instructor should alert librarians to the particular kinds of library resources students may be expected to use for their assignment, so that librarians can design the lecture accordingly.
5. Instructors will design their own syllabi, but here are some examples of minimum, medium, and maximum assignments emphasizing library skills:

I. Minimum Assignment

a) In cooperation with the library staff, instructors will show to their students the short slide-tape on library research (available fall 1982). Included with this presentation are topics specially designed to show off the library's resources. The student immediately pursues one of these topics, with the help of librarians, and subsequently draws up an annotated bibliography of articles on one subject.
(Time: one class period. Paper: one annotated bibliography.)

b) The student draws up an annotated bibliography of articles on a subject designed by the instructor. (The librarian will tailor his/her lecture to complement these subjects.) The annotation writing could accommodate an instructor's focus on either the writing process or the product, or both. For example, the annotation could describe a response to an article, and take the form of a journal entry; or it could be an exercise in rhetoric with conventional annotation format: brief summary and evaluation. Models for the second abound in literature of the professions.
(Time: one or two class periods. Paper: one annotated bibliography.)

II. Medium Assignment

The instructor will use the library tape early in the quarter, and then attach mini-research projects to one or more of the quarter's regular assignments. For example, a student's findings may replace the contents in a reader as the basis for an essay; or a comparison/contrast analysis may arise from research into a couple of similar articles from different newspapers. Please see sample assignments (following) which use this method.
(Time: several class periods. Papers: short, regular assignments which also demand some research.)

III. Maximum Assignment

The instructor will focus the course toward production of a full-blown research paper, using all relevant library resources and exploiting the need first to define, then narrow or broaden a topic as research progresses. Most instructors, responding to quarter-system pressures and the eclectic demands of English 3, will probably avoid this in its fullest form. But since the traditional research paper is usually argumentative or expository, any single set of materials gathered by the student could accommodate a series of briefer assignments—ones exploring the different rhetorical modes, for example.
(Time: research integrated into the class throughout the quarter. Paper: projects culminating in a full-blown research essay.)

Sample Assignments

For those who wish to attach mini-research projects to regular English 3 assignments, here are models of five papers. (Of course, instructors are free to design their own.)

#1 Rhetorical Mode: Definition/classification
Research: OED, glossaries, specialized dictionaries, course notes
Topic: Vocabulary in a university discipline

#2 Rhetorical Mode: Comparison/contrast; stylistic analysis
Research: Hometown newspaper, local newspaper, additional sources
Topic: Limitation of resources; style, content, audience

#3 Annotated Bibliography
Rhetorical Mode: Argumentation/persuasion; summary, paraphrase
Research: abstracts, indices, journals, reviews
Topic: Issues in academic disciplines

#4 Rhetorical Mode: Data analysis; critical analysis
Research: Popular and historical sources—almanacs, rituals, holidays, astrological forecasts
Topic: Dates/birthdates; analysis of events and outcomes

#5 Rhetorical Mode: Oral histories and interviews; critical analysis
Research: Library sources; interview
Topic: Thesis generation, idea development from "unlikely" sources

Assignments such as these require some directed research but do not interfere with the traditional pedagogy and goals of English 3. Five such assignments could constitute the quarter's work, or any one of them may be isolated, segmented, minimally required, or expanded.

Appendix 5. A Sourcebook for the New Writing Teacher

Susan Brienza, Cheryl Bolin, Faye Peitzman, and Patricia Taylor

Since this appendix is over 100 pages long, we'll summarize its contents here and refer new instructors to it. Copies can be checked out of Writing Programs or Freshman Writing. The sourcebook is divided into 7 sections, each section consisting of a few pages of introduction and advice and ten or so pages of sample exercises, sample papers, and excerpts from articles and textbooks. Each section also includes a brief bibliography for those who wish to read further.

The sourcebook contains the following sections:

1) Syllabi. This section contains advice on preparing a syllabus for a UCLA composition class. Sample syllabi are included.

2) Heuristic Exercises. This section includes some hints on invention as well as several specific techniques (e.g., "tree diagramming") for students to use.

3) Assignments. Again, advice is blended with samples. Assignments range from relatively simple "process" papers to full topics requiring analysis and stylistic imitation.

4) Stylistic Exercises. This section is particularly rich with student examples and contains readily adaptable exercises.

5) Editing and Revision. Practical advice on conducting class discussion and private conferences is followed by samples of dialogue from effective conferences as well as editing guides for students who will be discussing each other's papers.

6) Teacher Response. This particularly helpful section is subtitled "The Art of Writing Comments on Our Students' Papers." It contains a number of very specific tips on evaluation, and some samples of teachers' comments.

7) Practical Matters. Included here are sample handouts for students on such topics as documenting information and taking essay exams.

Supplementary Materials
on file in Writing Programs office

Review of A-1-3, 1980-81

Orientation Handout, Fall 1981

1981 Chancellor's Conference Handout

Issues for Discussion, A13 Committee Chairs, Spring 1982

Memo to Dean Weber, February 1982 - Enrollment in Freshman Writing Courses

Committee Reports
- Teacher Training
- Testing
- Tutorial
- ESL (with bibliography)
- Student Information Committee
- Curriculum and Texts
- Evaluation and Grades
- Special Sections, Lower Division
- Special Sections, Upper Division
- Editing Guides (with appendix)
- Conferencing
- Research

Surveys
- Program
  - University of Texas - Austin
    - Director's response: Carol Hartzog
    - Faculty responses: Pat Hunt, David Ward
  - Jackson State
- Faculty
  - Special Sections, Upper Division
  - Teacher Training
- Student
  - Personal Data Forms, English 1 and 3, Winter and Spring 1982 (with summary data)
  - English 1, Winter 1982 (with summary data and readers' reports)
  - English 3, Spring 1981 (with summary data and readers' reports)

Placement exams